

1 BILL LOCKYER
Attorney General of the State of California
2 ROBERT R. ANDERSON
Chief Assistant Attorney General
3 GERALD A. ENGLER
Senior Assistant Attorney General
4 PEGGY S. RUFFRA
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
5 State Bar No. 117315
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
6 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
Telephone: (415) 703-1362
7 Fax: (415) 703-1234
Email: peggy.ruffra@doj.ca.gov
8 Attorneys for Respondent

9 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 **CARLOS CHICO,**

13 Petitioner,

14 v.

15 **ROSEANNE CAMPBELL, Warden,**

16 Respondent.
17

C 05-01282 MJJ

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT
STATEMENT**

18 On January 24, 2005, petitioner, through counsel Benjamin Ramos, filed in the United
19 States District Court for the Eastern District of California a petition for writ of habeas corpus
20 challenging his criminal conviction in San Mateo County Superior Court. On March 8, 2005, on
21 respondent's motion, the Eastern District transferred the case to the Northern District. *See* Gen. L.R.
22 3-120(d).

23 On October 20, 2005, this Court scheduled a status conference. The parties submitted a
24 joint case management statement indicating that the next action to occur should be this Court's
25 review of the petition pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases and, if
26 applicable, the issuance of an Order to Show Cause. The Court subsequently took that status
27 conference off calendar.

28 On June 13, 2006, the Court requested another joint case management statement on the

1 current status of the case. The parties agree that the next action to occur should be this Court's
2 determination whether to issue an Order to Show Cause.^{1/} The parties further agree that no status
3 hearing is necessary at this point.

4
5 Dated: June 23, 2006

6 Respectfully submitted,

7
8

PEGGY S. RUFFRA
9 Attorney for Respondent

10
11
12

BENJAMIN RAMOS
13 Attorney for Petitioner

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 1. As respondent noted, the issue appears to involve the interpretation of a state sentencing
28 statute, which is not cognizable on federal habeas corpus review. *See Lewis v. Jeffers*, 497 U.S. 764,
783-784 (1990); *Christian v. Rhode*, 41 F.3d 461, 469 (9th Cir. 1994).